|    | Page 1                             |
|----|------------------------------------|
| 1  | UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT     |
| 2  | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK      |
| 3  | Case No. 18-23538-shl              |
| 4  | x                                  |
| 5  | In the Matter of:                  |
| 6  |                                    |
| 7  | SEARS HOLDING CORPORATION, et al., |
| 8  |                                    |
| 9  | Debtors.                           |
| 10 | x                                  |
| 11 | United States Bankruptcy Court     |
| 12 | 300 Quarropas Street, Room 248     |
| 13 | White Plains, NY 10601             |
| 14 |                                    |
| 15 |                                    |
| 16 | April 13, 2023                     |
| 17 | 11:11 AM                           |
| 18 |                                    |
| 19 |                                    |
| 20 |                                    |
| 21 | BEFORE:                            |
| 22 | HON. SEAN H. LANE                  |
| 23 | U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE              |
| 24 |                                    |
| 25 | ECRO: A. VARGAS                    |

Page 2 HEARING re Doc. #10832 Notice Of Agenda HEARING re Doc. #10800 Order Scheduling status conference Re: Beau LeBaron HEARING re Doc. #10825 Notice Of Hearing/Notice of status conference Re: Beau LeBaron Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

|    | Page 3  |  |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|--|
| 1  | APPEARANCES:                                    |  |  |  |
| 2  |   |  |  |  |
| 3  | WEIL GOTSHAL MANGES LLP                         |  |  |  |
| 4  | Attorneys for Debtors and SRZ Liquidating Trust |  |  |  |
| 5  | 767 Fifth Avenue                                |  |  |  |
| 6  | New York, NY 10153                              |  |  |  |
| 7  |   |  |  |  |
| 8  | BY: GARRETT A. FAIL                             |  |  |  |
| 9  | PHILIP DIDONATO                                 |  |  |  |
| 10 | FURQAAN SIDDIQUI                                |  |  |  |
| 11 |   |  |  |  |
| 12 | ALSO PRESENT:                                   |  |  |  |
| 13 | Beau LeBaron, Pro Se                            |  |  |  |
| 14 | William Murray, M3 Partners                     |  |  |  |
| 15 |   |  |  |  |
| 16 |   |  |  |  |
| 17 |   |  |  |  |
| 18 |   |  |  |  |
| 19 |   |  |  |  |
| 20 |   |  |  |  |
| 21 |   |  |  |  |
| 22 |   |  |  |  |
| 23 |   |  |  |  |
| 24 |   |  |  |  |
| 25 |   |  |  |  |

Page 4 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: So, with that we'll move on to the 11:00 matter, which is Sears Holdings Corporation. And so, 3 let me find out who is here for that case, and I will start 4 5 with Mr. LeBaron. 6 MR. LEBARON: Yes, I'm here. 7 THE COURT: All right. Good morning to you, sir. MR. LEBARON: Good morning. 8 9 THE COURT: And then let me find out who else is 10 here for that case, including the Liquidating Trust? 11 MR. FAIL: Good morning, Judge. Garrett Fail, 12 Weil Gotshal & Manges for the Liquidating Trust, and with me 13 in the virtual courtroom is Mr. Bill Murphy from M3 on 14 behalf of the Liquidating Trust. 15 THE COURT: All right. Good morning. 16 MR. FAIL: I also have my colleagues, Phil 17 DiDonato and Furquan Siddiqui here, as well. Thanks. THE COURT: All right. Good morning to you all. 18 19 And so, let me see if I can set the stage here because this 20 conference was set at my request, my understanding is that 21 Mr. LeBaron was, I believe, a contract employee for the 22 Debtors and he filed a proof of claim and had some questions and issues. There were some pleadings back and forth and I 23 think where it was left off in front of Judge Drain some 24 25 time ago, was that the parties were going to have a

discussion and then figure out, sort of, what next steps, whether there's some things they could agree upon, things that they profoundly disagreed upon. And so, at a certain point I inherited the case when Judge Drain retired, and I did get some inquiries from Mr. LeBaron and thought that lack of -- sometimes if people don't know where things stand, it leads to some confusion and some inefficiencies.

So, I thought it made sense to just have brief status conference to sort of check in and see where things are and where we go from here to try to wrap up any issues. That might mean agreements, it might mean having a matter that needs to be litigated, it could look a lot of different ways, but clarity is always good. So, I thought since Mr. LeBaron, you had the questions, I thought it made sense to hear from Mr. Fail first just to sort of set the stage on things and then we can take it from there. So, Mr. Fail?

MR. FAIL: Thank you, Judge, and thanks for setting this up. So, you're right about the procedural posture. There were claims that Mr. LeBaron filed a year after the unsecured -- general unsecured bar date and the pre-petition bar date, and six months after confirmation, we had a hearing before Judge Drain, who basically eliminated the duplicate claims and said that Mr. LeBaron could have another opportunity to try to justify the late filing of the claims to have them be addressed, and that's where it's been

Pg 6 of 28 Page 6 1 left off in Court. 2 Subsequently, and, you know, throughout the course 3 of this, Your Honor has received correspondence, Judge Drain has received correspondence. We have here, I think, by last 4 5 counts, there's somewhere between 300 and 400 emails that 6 we've received from Mr. LeBaron. If -- but I think, there's 7 a simple way to kind of frame this. And if it please the 8 Court, my colleague, Mr. Siddiqui can put up an exhibit. 9 But let me just start out at a high level to frame this, 10 Judge. We're not looking to spend a lot of estate resources 11 on this, and I think we're looking for the most efficient 12 way to bring this to a conclusion. 13 Can Mr. Siddiqui share his screen? 14 THE COURT: Sure. That would be fine. 15 MR. FAIL: Thank you. 16 THE COURT: And again, my only caveat is, today's 17 the status, we're not going to have a knock down/drag out 18 fight. Okay. 19 MR. FAIL: This is simply a status conference to 20 establish -- 100 percent not looking for -- not looking to 21 adjudicate anything. Oh, I think you need to -- the Court 22 would need to allow Mr. Siddiqui to share his screen. 23 THE COURT: All right. 24 CLERK: (Indiscernible.)

THE COURT: Can we -- hold on a second.

25

Can we

Page 7 1 share the -- allow someone to share their screen with us? 2 CLERK: For someone else to share a screen? THE COURT: Yeah. Counsel. 3 Can you show me (indiscernible). 4 CLERK: 5 THE COURT: Hold on, one minute. 6 MR. FAIL: Thank you. 7 THE COURT: Seems to be the morning for 8 interesting technical things, so my apologies. 9 MR. FAIL: You know what, Judge? We don't -- if 10 it's -- if it's troubling, we don't have to do it. I can 11 walk you through it. 12 THE COURT: We'll give it 45 seconds and if we can 13 make it work, great, if not, just --14 MR. FAIL: Absolutely. 15 THE COURT: So, I know the "national emergency" 16 will be over May 11th, but for those of us who are not 35 17 and younger, it can't happen soon enough. So -- all right. 18 And I shouldn't say that because I have a son who does 19 computer science stuff, so he had to get the gene from 20 somewhere, but I'm just too out of date, so I'm mortified to 21 admit. 22 Okay, I'm going to make him a co-host. THE COURT: All right. Hold on a second. We're 23 24 going to make you a co-host, which should allow you to share 25 your screen.

Page 8 1 CLERK: And then once he's done --2 THE COURT: All right. Give it a shot. 3 MR. FAIL: Thank you, Judge. THE COURT: Oh, don't thank me because you know I 4 5 had nothing to do with it. 6 MR. FAIL: Well, I'd say --7 THE COURT: All right. MR. FAIL: So, this is -- this is a summary of 8 9 what the Debtor and then the Liquidating Trust has been able 10 to discern has been asserted in the claims in the various 11 pleadings. Obviously, Mr. LeBaron could correct or bring us 12 up to date. But since I'm going first, this is what we see 13 he was seeking, a total of \$70,000. So, just to put it all 14 in perspective, you know, we don't want to spend a ton on 15 this. But if we break it down in the right-hand column, I 16 think just for the Court to remind itself and for Mr. 17 LeBaron, the Debtor filed bankruptcy on October 15th, 2008 -- '18, 2018, wrong case, 2018. And so, everything before 18 that we're calling pre-petition, so that's \$21,000 out of 19 20 the \$70,000. Pursuant to the Bankruptcy Code, as you know, 21 Judge and for Mr. LeBaron, certain amounts, up to \$12,850 in 22 this case, could possibly be entitled to priority. Otherwise, the rest is a general unsecured claim, which, as 23 24 Your Honor knows and for Mr. LeBaron's benefit, are not 25 currently receiving distributions and, you know, the

likelihood that they will is remote. So, from the first column of pre-Petition claims, what folks could be playing for, you know, is \$12,850.

Then there was a year -- there was a post-petition period where the Debtors operated for only a few months before selling their assets and their business and operations to transform. So, the post-petition period, while the Debtors were in operation, we can discern that there's roughly \$13,300 being asserted there. And then the other half that's being asserted, appears to be for a period where the Debtors did not run the business or a business that Mr. LeBaron continued to work for. So, just at a super high level, 50 percent could possibly be on our watch, 50 percent is not.

Another way to slice this, looking at the prepetition period, as I said is, \$12,850 out of the \$21,000 is possibly money good from the (indiscernible). So, a total of \$26,216.37 by our calculations is what we're possibly talking about paying out, \$26,216. You know, this isn't a hearing, but just so Mr. LeBaron can hear that this Liquidating Trust has reviewed and given consideration to the claims that are currently late and not really pending in our view. But he's seeking, in the first two lines, wages and vacation wages. According to the records that we have, he wasn't a salaried waged employee. He was entirely

compensation based. So, there's no basis that we have to allow the \$13,000, roughly, that's being sought for those categories.

The next two categories of unlawful deductions and commissions relate, as best we can tell, Mr. LeBaron sold jobs for the Sears Home Improvements business, and then before they were paid for, they were canceled or there were issues with them. And pursuant to the company policy on how commissioned salespeople are compensated, if the company doesn't get paid or the jobs don't go through, then the salespeople don't earn a commission. So, as best we can tell, that's what he's claiming, but, you know, we don't believe there's an entitlement to it.

There's \$20,000 being sought through an Employee
Benefit Plan. We don't have a record of anything like that.
The Debtors' records and now the Trust records show that
there was a Plan that Mr. LeBaron withdrew from and a
balance of less than \$300 was transferred and he should have
had access to it, so we don't think that there's merits to
that.

And then the remainder appears to be on

Transform's watch, if anything, so we don't have any kind of record or liability for that. We're not looking to kind of make anybody's life harder, certainly not looking to take up this Court's time or Mr. LeBaron's time pursuing recoveries

where there can't be any. We're happy to try to find a way to end this in an efficient way, whether it's today or shortly thereafter. But given Mr. LeBaron's pro se status, you know, expect that we would want the Court to bless and relieve us all, from any further burdens if there was anything offered or paid.

But wanted to let this Court know and Mr. LeBaron know that the Trustee, due to consideration to the merits of the allegations, and unfortunately just don't see -- just don't see the liability here.

THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. LeBaron, I'm happy to hear from you, but let me just see if I can distill a couple of things that I think you should think about. And I think we can stop the screen sharing now, so -- great. Thank you.

MR. FAIL: Thank you.

MR. LEBARON: Thank you.

THE COURT: So, whenever we have claims that are filed, it's my duty as a Judge then to adjudicate claim objections, figure out how things should be treated. And there are a couple of things that, without deciding the merits of any arguments, there are things that I see would have to be decided by me if there's a litigated proceeding, meaning people can't agree on something. One is, what is actually on the Debtor's watch and what's on the new

company's watch, so when the new company took over. Now, I realize from your perspective, that's not a great thing to hear, right. Because from your point of view, you're working and it's -- but the reality is in Bankruptcy Court, that I have jurisdiction here in the Court by virtue of these cases over the Debtor and what happened to the Debtor after the Plan was confirmed, and a new buyer who comes in and runs the business and may have liabilities by virtue of things like people working there, is not something that is -- if that's the case, truly the case, then that's something that isn't necessarily part of the bankruptcy for purposes of a claim. It's not a very -- again, not a very helpful thing to hear as a claimant because you're not viewing the world that way at all, which I completely understand. it's something that, in the interest of sort of full disclosure to just tell you some things to think about and, sort of, where we might go from here. So, that's one aspect.

Another aspect is, I understand there's -- you heard something about a late filed claim. There's lots of rules and case law about a late filed claim and what happens is, that if someone objects to that, then I have to decide it under the applicable legal standard, which is something that is set well before I took the bench 12 and a half years ago, something called the excusable neglect standard, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

look at that issue. So, that's another, sort of, big picture issue out there.

And I guess the third big picture issue is that Mr. Fail mentioned different buckets, timeframe-wise, of claims and certain things pre-petition, post-petition, and then after the sale. And those can be very relevant in understanding treatment because unfortunately, there's a lot of bad news to hand out in bankruptcy. And he mentioned unsecured claimants right now not getting anything in the case and that is -- that is my understanding, as well.

Now, there are certain categories of claims that are treated different than general unsecured claims and he mentioned priority claims, and they are in their own separate category. And there are certain things that trigger that status and other things that don't. And there are some very specific rules set forth in the Bankruptcy Code, we don't make them up on the fly. They have to do with timing and kinds of things, the kind of claim that it is. And so, that's -- that gets a little -- it's a little less -- it's a big point, but in terms of figuring that stuff out, it's very detailed, so you have to look at the counterclaim, you have to look at the time, and all those things. You don't necessarily get there, depending on how the first two issues might be looked at, one is the late file claim and the other is, who -- on whose watch the

liability is incurred.

So, those are three things that jump out to me as a judge that would have to be decided. And so, here's -
I'm happy to going to hear from you in one second. My thought with something like this is to give the parties a brief chance to have a conversation and see if they can work something out that's efficient here and makes sense for all sides. If you did, you would come back to me in Court to ask me to bless that settlement so that it would be a full and final resolution of things, and that's fine.

MR. LEBARON: Right.

THE COURT: If you don't reach an agreement, that's fine too. Then what -- the next step would be to have a hearing and to figure out, to resolve any outstanding objections there are. But what I would want to do is set a timeframe for all that, so people sort of know they have a certain amount of time to negotiate. And then after that, people can file whatever additional pleadings they want and then we'll set a hearing.

So, my thought is that setting some timeframes are always helpful because this has obviously hung around for a while. It's not in anybody's best interest to have that happen. So, it's a good idea to get this done one way or the other at a certain point.

So, my thought would be to give people, say 45

days, 60 days to chat, then set a deadline for any additional submissions that might make sense, and then we could schedule a hearing if it comes to that. So, I'm trying to give you my perspective on where we are, the issues that I see and what procedure would look like to go from where we are to the end.

And so, with that, Mr. LeBaron, anything that you wanted to ask about or information you wanted to pass along, recognizing that we're not litigating any of these claims today.

MR. LEBARON: I'll be very quick.

THE COURT: Yep.

MR. LEBARON: Okay, so, first of all, thank you

Court for letting -- setting me something. I know that Mr.

Fail received a lot of emails from me, and I apologize for

all the messages. I was taking care of my mom here during

that time, and it was somewhat of a difficult time because I

was just extremely busy. You know, taking care of person

with cancer at that point was a full-time job for me.

THE COURT: I'm sorry to hear that.

MR. LEBARON: So, I -- my (indiscernible) came sporadically in between here, and I apologize for a lot of my emotional outbursts during that time. I was pretty -- I don't know, I was in the moment, if you know what I mean.

So, with that being said, with regards to the

numbers that you guys were talking about, I really would appreciate some kind of numbers, some kind of date because as far as I see it, I was let go from Sears at 6/12/2019. I believe that sounds about correct. And when you're talking about the pre-petition, the \$12,850, then you said something about \$26,000 regarding the various -- in between the pre-petition and for the time when Transform actually takes over. What happened here is really, a large amount of this number was sent to you guys by the California Labor Board. So, I went to the California Labor Board thinking this was the route.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LEBARON: And they decided to submit it for me, and when they put it through, you know, the \$20,000 was, sort of, life insurance policy, and I thought I was considered a W-2 commissioned compensation project consultant. So, I was actually a W-2 employee as far as I know. I wasn't a contract vendor. I'm being shown as one. I believe I'm -- maybe I'm being shown different in the wrong zone for this payment because truly, this is regarding wages. These issues are not in California, wages are wages, and I was a W-2 employee. I get a W-2, you know, tax form. Taxes were paid, my insurance was paid. They paid for my expenses. I was in training. I met all those standards in California.

So, I think in that area, I'm not exempt, I'm actually an employee. And I think in that sense, I believe the Labor Board, when they sent me to you, is the idea was that I was gunning for a certain amount, but the prepetition amount I wasn't allowed to come after, according to That was the Labor Board. I was already late to the bar date at that point. And I guess my only statement to Mr. Fail is this, I was required by Sears to run appointments every day from the 11th of November, the beginning of basically the bar date, I guess the notice went out, which I don't even remember ever seeing a notice. know around April the 9th I was told of the notice of some kind, and we were told to ignore that as if we were working for Sears still. Keep working. And we worked every day, five days a week for 16 hours a day, we were fielding appointments. There's no time for anything else. You do that, then you go home, and you turn in the orders you make. I knew one mindset: make revenue for the employer. needed us to generate revenue. And that was for the -- as far as I'm concerned, for these entire activities, this bankruptcy. I was trying to help the Debtor by generating revenue for everything I did. That was my goal. I'm going to have a war with them --THE COURT: Mr. LeBaron, one thing that I'll ask Mr. Fail, whether this would be helpful or not, I don't know

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 18 1 if you have -- if he has a W-2, if that would be helpful to 2 share with you where you all have a full -- sort of a full set of information on this or not. 3 MR. FAIL: I don't think it matters, Judge. 4 I 5 mean, I appreciate it. I'm happy to --6 MR. LEBARON: (Indiscernible) --7 THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on, Mr. LeBaron, I just 8 asked Mr. Fail a question, so we can't talk at the same 9 time. So, go ahead, Mr. Fail. 10 MR. LEBARON: Sure. 11 MR. FAIL: I don't think it matters for our 12 purposes because I was using the categorization not, you 13 know -- whether it's commission and he's owed that or not, 14 the way that we read what he was asking for seemed to be an 15 hourly wage and an hourly vacation. It's just unclear to us 16 what he is asking for because we're not looking to litigate, 17 you know, excusable neglect, you know, and have five 18 different trials to just get to the merits, Judge. It's 19 just unclear what he's asking for. I don't think the W-2 20 matters though. 21 THE COURT: All right. So, here's -- so what I'd 22 like to do is to give you a chance to chat and what I think Mr. LeBaron would be helpful is, the California Labor Board 23 24 is not -- does not necessarily view these things the same 25 way the bankruptcy world does.

Pg 19 of 28 Page 19 1 MR. FAIL: Right. 2 THE COURT: The Bankruptcy Code trumps all that. 3 And again, for your purposes, it makes life a little 4 confusing, more than a little confusing. 5 MR. LEBARON: I agree. 6 THE COURT: So, what I think would be helpful is 7 to do this. I'm going to give you 60 days to have 8 conversations and see if you can work something out that's 9 In the next two weeks though, Mr. LeBaron, I sufficient. 10 think it would be helpful to send an email, just one, just 11 one email --12 MR. LEBARON: I get you. 13 THE COURT: -- and it would contain the following 14 information: very plain statement, not dressed up in the 15 categories of the California Labor Board, as to what you 16 think you're entitled to. So, if it's wages and benefits, 17 it's wages and benefits, and for what periods of time. And 18 you mentioned the date when you think things ended, then 19 that's -- that would be helpful to have that as well. 20 MR. LEBARON: Okay. 21 THE COURT: And so -- and if you have a question 22 about timing, meaning that you don't understand particular elements of some dates that Mr. Fail mentioned or where he's 23

getting those dates, you can put those questions in there.

And also, just for ease of just everybody on the same page,

24

I would enclose a copy of whatever W-2, most recent W-2 you have in terms of your employment status because I think that's what will -- my sense is, I could be wrong, but my sense is that will really govern whatever your claim really is because it would be, whatever I was entitled to get as an employee for these periods of time, and then that way nobody has to guess.

And if you could do that in about two weeks, send one email, so just a short statement, shouldn't be 15 pages, should be more like three or four, you can put a chart and whatever you think is the clearest way to explain it. Don't worry about whatever the California Labor Board said --

MR. LEBARON: I will do that.

THE COURT: -- and just explain it in plain

English. And then Mr. Fail will have then a couple of weeks

to get back to you -- two weeks to get back to you. He can

do something in writing. Also, put in your contact

information so that he can respond or somebody that he works

with can respond. And then you also then have a little bit

of time to have a discussion.

If the discussion goes somewhere and you want to put something in front of me for approval, great. I will say, I think Mr. Fail mentioned it a few times and he's right, that the process for resolving claims objections is - it's about fairness and everybody being heard, which is

great, but it also means that a small claim will often take the same amount of court time as the large claim.

MR. LEBARON: Okay.

THE COURT: And it means that it's going to take time of yours and of the Liquidating Trust and of a lot of folks. And there are times when that makes a lot of sense, and there's time when it makes less sense. I am the person who has to decide these things if people can't agree and that's what I'll do. But it doesn't necessarily mean that having me decide is the most wise course of action.

MR. LEBARON: I got you.

THE COURT: Now, you know -- so, for all these things, there -- the more issues there are to litigate, that means the more things that I have to decide and the more time we might spend in court. It also means that more legal jeopardy that folks have in terms of the success of their claim, as a matter of going ahead with Court. That's all for you to judge in the first instance. I'll look at it when it comes to me if I have to decide.

So, what I'll do is, I'm going to ask Mr. Fail to put together a letter just with a schedule and it'll have -the schedule will have two weeks from today that you submit something to him, two weeks after that, he or somebody at his office gets back to you with a response, gives you about another 30 days to discuss. If that doesn't work and you

don't reach your resolution, which again, most things in Bankruptcy Court, most things do get resolved that way --

MR. LEBARON: (Indiscernible) --

THE COURT: -- because people recognize that litigating in front of me, while I certainly like to think I'm a nice, pleasant person, is not the best way to spend your time in life. If that doesn't work, then what I would ask is that we put together a deadline for people to file any other submissions that they want to make, and I think probably would make sense for Mr. Fail to go first to say here's what his objection is, what he wants to pursue in terms of objecting to your claim, and that can be some, you know, probably 75 days out. I would think if we're talking about 60 days to chat, 75 days and then Mr. LeBaron, you can have another couple of weeks to respond to that. And then you can leave open a hearing date and we'll probably tie it to an omnibus hearing date. But we'll make sure to give everybody plenty of notice so that people could make time in their schedules. And that's how we would do it.

What I might encourage, and I'd be open to suggestions this way, is if we're going to have a hearing, rather than having just argument is to have an evidentiary hearing, just have one hearing, do it all at the same time so folks don't have to come back more than once. But you're closer to it than I am, so since it -- since Mr. Fail, on

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

behalf of the Liquidating Trust, would be the party making the objection, I'll leave it to him in the first instance as to what his request would be, whether he wanted to have an evidentiary hearing and just address everything at once or whether he thinks it's appropriate to just have essentially an argument without any testimony or need for evidence. Again, you're in a better position to judge that than I am. So, Mr. LeBaron --MR. LEBARON: May I ask a question, please? THE COURT: -- go ahead. Yeah, please. MR. LEBARON: Sorry to interrupt you, sir. actually have a question for Mr. Fail. Do you have the compensation policy from California only for consultants? Do you have a copy of that? And if not, I could send you a copy of that. I think it might help and I think also what might help is --MR. FAIL: I'm happy to review that. That might be helpful, so I appreciate that, and we can certainly speak -- that would be fine. Why don't you send that to me and then --MR. LEBARON: I'm going to send that to you guys. I'm also going to send you, in my initial claim there's two Excel sheets, one large one that's got all of the information from all of my pay, from all the specific payouts. It's really all pre-petition there only. So,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Pg 24 of 28

whatever came after the petition at that point, the number after pre-petition -- to me, it was about \$23,000, so your number \$26,000 is about right. You're sitting around \$26,000, I think. The real number -- because the rest -- that was when I was with Transform as far as I'm concerned and that is in California. I'm still having a hearing based on this right now.

THE COURT: Yeah. Well, I think --

MR. LEBARON: That's Transform (indiscernible).
So, there's a big split.

THE COURT: Yeah, I think there is definitely a -unless I've got -- we all have the facts wrong, there's
definitely a big dividing line once Transform takes over --

MR. LEBARON: There is.

THE COURT: -- and that's one of the reasons why having a conversation makes some sense just because the claim itself is going to be sort of half of whatever had been contemplated just by virtue of the Transform sort of situation. So, all right. So, what I'm going to ask Mr. Fail to do is to draft a schedule. It can be just in a letter. He'll send a copy to you; he'll send it to me. What I normally do in those circumstances is, I write the schedule is approved, so ordered. I put my name on it and date on it, everybody gets a copy, and then you all will go ahead and exchange information and chat. And then if we

Page 25 need to get things decided, what I'll probably do is, I'll 1 2 wait to get the papers. If I have a question about what kind of a hearing makes sense, we'll have another short chat 3 about that. It won't be as long as this one. It'll 4 5 probably be five or 10 minutes, but just so everybody's on 6 the same page. Hopefully, we can do that very briefly. And 7 we'll get it resolved one way or the other because a 8 resolution, I think that's the one thing everybody agrees is 9 in everybody's best interest. 10 So, we will do that. And with that, Mr. LeBaron, 11 any other questions you might have? 12 MR. LEBARON: That's it. Thank you very much. 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 MR. FAIL: Judge, I just want to say, we may also, 15 and I appreciate you gave us the flexibility to determine at 16 a later date, if it's necessary, the Court could also 17 estimate without further needs. We'll try to do everything 18 we can to try to avoid any of this, and if not, we'll do our 19 best to minimize --20 THE COURT: I'm open to creative solutions. 21 open to creative solutions --22 MR. FAIL: All right, I appreciate it. THE COURT: -- that might cut the Gordian knot, to 23 24 quote a phrase. All right. Well, thank you very much for 25 your time this morning.

Page 26 MR. FAIL: Thank you for your time, Judge. THE COURT: And I'll be talking to you all in the not-too-distant future and have a good afternoon. MR. LEBARON: Thank you very much. THE COURT: Thank you. (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 11:41 AM) 

|    | Pg 27 of 28                            |         |      |
|----|--|---------|------|
|    |  | Page 27 |      |
| 1  | INDEX                                  |         |      |
| 2  |  |         |      |
| 3  | RULINGS                                |         |      |
| 4  |  | Page    | Line |
| 5  | Set aside 60 days to attempt to settle | 19      | 7    |
| 6  | Mr. Fail will put together a schedule  |         |      |
| 7  | For Court approval.                    | 24      | 20   |
| 8  |  |         |      |
| 9  |  |         |      |
| 10 |  |         |      |
| 11 |  |         |      |
| 12 |  |         |      |
| 13 |  |         |      |
| 14 |  |         |      |
| 15 |  |         |      |
| 16 |  |         |      |
| 17 |  |         |      |
| 18 |  |         |      |
| 19 |  |         |      |
| 20 |  |         |      |
| 21 |  |         |      |
| 22 |  |         |      |
| 23 |  |         |      |
| 24 |  |         |      |
| 25 |  |         |      |

Page 28 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing 4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 Songa M. deslarski Hydl 6 7 8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Veritext Legal Solutions 21 330 Old Country Road 22 Suite 300 Mineola, NY 11501 23 24 25 Date: April 17, 2023